

CITY OF CHULA VISTA

**Growth Management Oversight
Commission (GMOC)**

***2011 GMOC ANNUAL
REPORT***

Threshold Review Period 7/1/09 to 6/30/10

April 7, 2011

**Approved by the Planning Commission (Resolution No. PCM 10-20) and
City Council (Resolution No. 2011-059) on April 7, 2011**

GMOC Members

Carl Harry (Development)
Armida Torres (Business)
James Doud (Southwest)
Steven Lizarraga (Education)
Bryan Felber (Planning Commission Representative)
Duane Bazzel (Environmental)
Eric Sutton (Southeast)
Russ Hall, Vice Chair (Center City)
David W. Krogh, Chair (Sweetwater/Bonita)

City Staff

Rosemarie Rice – Management Assistant
Kimberly Vander Bie – Associate Planner/Growth Management Coordinator
Ed Batchelder – Advance Planning Manager

City of Chula Vista
Development Services Department
276 Fourth Avenue
Chula Vista, CA 91910
(619) 691-5101
<http://www.chulavistaca.gov/>

GMOC Chair Cover Memo

DATE: April 7, 2011

TO: The Honorable Mayor and City Council
Members of the Planning Commission
City of Chula Vista

FROM: David Krogh, Chairman
Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC)

SUBJECT: Executive Summary - 2011 GMOC Annual Report

The Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC) is pleased to submit its 2011 annual report for your consideration and action. This year's report constituted a full scope review, in comparison to the limited review conducted last year. Upon completion of this report, the GMOC will continue working with city staff to complete the top-to-bottom review this year, and we solicit Council's support toward that end.

This year's report indicates that **Libraries** is non-compliant for the 7th successive year. Last year, we expressed our support for creative suggestions to remedy that through inexpensive, expedient measures, even if "construction of a facility" may not become financially feasible for a number of years. The Library Director informed us of the results of explorations that have been undertaken during the past year, and that an updated Master Plan is nearing completion. That is good; however, it is our duty to point out that we remain at **13% below** compliance, with an indication of being **18-26% below** by 2015.

The GMOC has received news from the Library and Finance Directors that the best long-term plan may NOT include the planned Rancho Del Rey library. We encourage Council to adopt an updated Library Facilities Master Plan that provides interim and long-term solutions to **bring the library system into conformance**.

The **Police** Priority II Threshold Standard is non-compliant for the 13th year in a row. Last year's report commended the Police Department for accomplishing significant improvements during the previous two review cycles. There was some slight deterioration this year, and prospects for the future appear worse, due to budgetary factors.

Moreover, we learned from Chief Bejarano, after his first full year on the job, that the Police Department's response times may be a poor reflection of the actual "real world time" that it takes for the police to respond, especially in the case of Priority II calls. In our top-to-bottom review, we will likely recommend adoption of more "industry standard" methods for measuring response times, which would then be comparable with most other communities. In addition, we will contemplate a more realistic and attainable threshold standard after the Police Department provides the GMOC with pertinent historical and statistical information to help us as we finish our top-to-bottom discussions regarding the Priority II threshold standard.

Traffic improvements made in one problem area were offset by some deterioration in another, and a congested segment of Olympic Parkway is now requiring some attention. The GMOC supports timely city implementation of recommended short-term solutions, as well as planning a

schedule for construction of Heritage Road between Olympic Parkway and Main Street to help alleviate the problem. In addition, we would encourage City Council to actively work with SANDAG, which is exploring options for increasing usage of SR-125 in the wake of the owner's bankruptcy proceedings. Toll aversion seems to have more drivers opting to use Olympic Parkway, which is contributing to its congestion. We would appreciate the City Manager's and Council's support of continuing efforts to maintain performance on all the most challenging city roadway segments.

In the **Fiscal** area, the GMOC has repeatedly made a recommendation regarding creation of a PFDIF prioritization policy, and that recommendation has not been acted upon by Council, the City Manager, or staff. This year, we are making the recommendation, once again, but this time it includes a 90-day timeframe to act. We strongly request that the City Council and City Manager carefully consider the recommendation in a timely manner.

To summarize about the remaining quality of life topics:

- **Schools** - Data indicates potential of future non-compliance for the Chula Vista Elementary School District
- **Fire and Emergency Services** - Performance remained compliant against the threshold
- **Parks and Recreation, Sewer, Drainage, Water, and Air Quality**, all of which were not reviewed last year, were found compliant this year

I would like to thank staff members and city department managers for their time and effort, without which this year's report would not have been possible

Table of Contents

GMOC CHAIR COVER MEMO	1-2
TABLE OF CONTENTS	3
REPORT PREFACE – QUALITY OF LIFE: A BROAD OVERVIEW	4
1.0 INTRODUCTION	5
1.1 Threshold Standards	5
1.2 The Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC)	5
1.3 GMOC 2011 Annual Review Process	5-6
1.4 Growth Forecast	6
1.5 Report Organization	6
2.0 THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE SUMMARY	7
3.0 THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE DISCUSSIONS	8
3.1 Libraries.....	8
3.1.1 Continued Non-Compliance of Threshold Standard	8-9
3.1.2 Library Facilities Master Plan Update	9-10
3.2 Police	10
3.2.1 Priority I Threshold Findings	11-12
3.2.2 Non-Compliance of Priority II Threshold	12-13
3.3 Traffic	13
3.3.1 Non-Compliance of Threshold Standard	14
3.3.2 Olympic Parkway Congestion	14-15
3.4 Fiscal	15
3.4.1 Prioritization of Projects Funded By Public Facilities Development Impact Fees (PFDIF) Program	15-16
3.5 Fire and Emergency Services.....	16
3.5.1 Reporting Period Consistency	16-17
3.5.2 Effects of Using San Diego Dispatch	17
3.5.3 Aging Engine Fleet	17
3.5.4 Fire Facilities Master Plan	17
3.6 Schools	18
3.6.1 Potential Non-Compliance	18-19
3.7 Parks and Recreation.....	19
3.7.1 Threshold Compliance	19
3.7.2 Parks & Recreation Facilities Master Plan	19
3.8 Sewer	20
3.8.1 Long-Term Treatment Capacity	21
3.9 Drainage.....	21
3.9.1 Maintenance of Existing Drainage Channels	21
3.10 Air Quality	22
3.10.1 Threshold Compliance	22-23
3.11 Water	23
3.11.1 Meeting Water Demands	24
4.0 APPENDICES	25
4.1 Appendix A – Growth Forecast	
4.2 Appendix B – Threshold Compliance Questionnaires	

Report Preface – Quality of Life: A Broad Overview

The Growth Management Oversight Commission's (GMOC) principal task is to assess the impacts of growth on the community's quality of life and to recommend corrective actions in areas where the city has the ability to act and/or can make a difference. This is an important and vital service. No other city in the region has an independent citizen body such as the GMOC to provide this kind of report card to an elected body.

The GMOC takes seriously its role of monitoring the impacts of growth and reporting to the City Council. Our membership also believes that it has a responsibility to express concerns over issues that may not be part of the formal GMOC purview so that the City Council and the community have a full perspective regarding the city's quality of life. At the same time, the GMOC has tried to avoid duplication of effort, being mindful of the roles of other boards and commissions in taking the lead in addressing various types of issues, and to focus on its main priorities.

With the city's ongoing budget challenges, the GMOC recognizes that the overall quality of life in Chula Vista has been affected. Reduced hours of operation at our libraries and recreational facilities are two glaring examples of the sacrifices the community is making. As the city strives to creatively maintain a good quality of life with reduced resources, the GMOC is encouraged by positive signs that a healthy level of growth seems to be germinating in the city, once again.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Threshold Standards

In November 1987, the City Council adopted the original Threshold Standards Policy for Chula Vista, establishing “quality-of-life” indicators for eleven public facility and service topics, consisting of: Air Quality, Drainage, Fire and Emergency Services, Fiscal, Libraries, Parks & Recreation, Police, Schools, Sewer, Traffic and Water. The Policy addresses each topic in terms of a goal, objective(s), threshold standard(s), and implementation measures. Adherence to these citywide standards is intended to preserve and enhance both the environment and the quality of life of residents, as growth occurs.

1.2 The Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC)

The Threshold Standards Policy also established the creation of the Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC), a body to provide an independent, annual, citywide threshold standards compliance review. The GMOC is composed of nine council-appointed members, representing each of the city’s four major geographic areas; a cross-section of interests, including education, environment, business, and development; and a member of the Planning Commission.

The GMOC’s review is structured around three timeframes:

1. A fiscal year cycle: To accommodate City Council review of GMOC recommendations that may have budget implications. This 2011 Annual Report focuses on fiscal year July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010;
2. The second half of 2010 and beginning of 2011: To identify and address pertinent issues identified during this timeframe, and to assure that the GMOC can and does respond to current events; and
3. A five-year forecast: The period from January 2011 through December 2015 is assessed for potential threshold compliance concerns. This assures that the GMOC has a future orientation.

The GMOC annually distributes questionnaires to the relevant city departments and public facility and service agencies to monitor the status of threshold standards compliance. When the questionnaires are completed, the GMOC reviews them and deliberates issues of compliance. They also evaluate the appropriateness of the threshold standards, whether they should be amended, and whether any new threshold standards should be considered.

1.3 GMOC 2011 Annual Review Process

The GMOC held eleven meetings between October 2010 and March 2011, which were open to the public. Representatives from the city departments and public agencies associated with the threshold compliance questionnaires gave presentations to the Commission and discussed the questionnaires they had completed (attached in

Appendix B). Through this process, city staff and the GMOC identified issues and conditions, and they are discussed in this report.

The final GMOC annual report is required to be transmitted through the Planning Commission to the City Council at a joint meeting, scheduled for April 7, 2011.

1.4 Growth Forecast

The Development Services Department annually prepares a Five-Year Growth Forecast; the latest of which was issued in October 2010. The Forecast provides departments and outside agencies with an estimate of the maximum amount of residential growth anticipated over the next five years. Copies of the Forecast were distributed with the GMOC questionnaires to help the departments and agencies determine if their respective public facilities/services would be able to accommodate the forecasted growth. The Growth Forecast from November 2010 through December 2015 indicated an additional 7,056 residential units could be permitted for construction in the City over the next five years, (6,618 in the east and 438 units in the west), for an annual average of 1,324 in the east and 88 units in the west, or just over 1,411 housing units permitted per year on average, citywide.

The projected units permitted per year on average, citywide, is up 110 units from last year's forecast of 1,301 units.

1.5 Report Organization

The 2011 GMOC Annual Report is organized into four sections:

Section 1: Introduction; description of GMOC's role and review process; an explanation of the Residential Growth Forecast; and an outline of the 2011 report

Section 2: A threshold compliance summary in table format

Section 3: A threshold by threshold discussion of issues, acknowledgments, statements of concern (if any), and recommendations

Section 4: Appendices

2.0 THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE SUMMARY

The following table indicates a summary of the GMOC's conclusions regarding threshold standards for the 2011 annual review cycle. Eight thresholds were met and three were not.

2011 THRESHOLD STANDARD – ANNUAL REVIEW SUMMARY REVIEW PERIOD 7/1/09 THROUGH 6/30/10				
Threshold	Threshold Met	Threshold Not Met	Potential of Future Non-compliance	Adopt/Fund Tactics to Achieve Compliance
1. Libraries		X	X	X
2. Police				
Priority I	X			
Priority II		X	X	X
3. Traffic		X	X	X
4. Fiscal	X			
5. Fire/EMS	X			
6. Schools				
CV Elementary School District	X		X	
Sweetwater Union High School District	X			
7. Parks Recreation				
<i>Land</i>	X			
<i>Facilities</i>	X			
8. Sewer	X			
9. Drainage	X			
10. Air Quality	X			
11. Water	X			

3.0 THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE DISCUSSIONS

3.1 LIBRARIES

Threshold Standard:

The city shall construct 60,000 gross square feet (GSF) of additional library space, over the June 30, 2000 GSF total, in the area east of Interstate 805, by build-out. The construction of said facilities shall be phased such that the city will not fall below the citywide ratio of 500 GSF per 1,000 population. Library facilities are to be adequately equipped and staffed.

Threshold Finding: Non-Compliance

3.1.1 Continued Non-Compliance of Threshold Standard

LIBRARIES			
	Population	Total Gross Square Footage of Library Facilities	Gross Square Feet of Library Facilities Per 1000 Population
Threshold	X	X	500 Sq. Ft.
5-Year Projection (2015)	249,435	92,000 ¹ 95,400 ² 102,000 ³	369 382 409
12-Month Projection (12/31/11)	237,329	102,000	430
FY 2009-10	233,692	102,000	436
FY 2008-09	233,108	102,000	437
FY 2007-08	231,305	102,000	441
FY 2006-07	227,723	102,000	448
FY 2005-06	223,423	102,000	457
FY 2004-05	220,000	102,000	464
FY 2003-04	211,800	102,000	482
FY 2002-03	203,000	102,000	502
FY 2001-02	195,000	102,000	523
FY 2000-01	187,444	102,000	544
FY 1999-00	178,645	102,000	571

1. If Eastlake shared use library closes
2. If Eastlake closes and Otay Ranch storefront alternative opens
3. If Eastlake remains open

Issue: For the seventh consecutive year, the city has not complied with the threshold standard of providing 500 gross square feet of library facilities per 1,000 people.

Discussion: For the past several years, it has been anticipated that construction of a 30,000-square-foot library on vacant, city-owned property in Rancho del Rey would satisfy the Libraries threshold standard, and that construction of a 30,000-square-foot library in the Eastern Urban Center (EUC) would keep the threshold standard in compliance, as the city's population increases.

In an effort to get construction of the Rancho del Rey library completed as soon as possible, thereby ending Libraries' non-compliance status, the 2009 GMOC Annual Report recommended that "City Council designate construction of the Rancho del Rey library branch the top priority of the five remaining PFDIF projects." To date, Council has not formally prioritized the PFDIF projects, and city management estimates that construction funds for the library may not be available for ten more years.

With such dire financial predictions in regards to construction of the Rancho del Rey branch, and with new information emerging from a draft updated Libraries Facilities Master Plan (see Section 3.1.2, below), the GMOC is supportive of continued efforts to find the best solution and is open to considering any proposals for meeting the threshold standard.

The 2010 GMOC Annual Report recommended that Council "formally identify and adopt funding for an interim and/or permanent solution, based on recommendations from the Library Director, to bring the library system closer to conformance before 2012." Such formal action has not occurred. However, the Library Director has continued to seek interim alternatives to a full-service location on the east side of Interstate 805. Currently, there is a conceptual proposal from Otay Ranch Town Center to convert an empty retail space into a small branch library of approximately 3,400 square feet, and to allow the city to use the space, rent-free, for a period of 3 to 5 years. The GMOC supports this proposal.

Recommendation: That City Council adopt a Library Facilities Master Plan that provides interim and long-term solutions to bringing the library system into conformance.

3.1.2 Library Facilities Master Plan Update

Issue: None

Discussion: During this review cycle, great strides were made in updating the Library Facilities Master Plan. A draft is currently being presented to the community through various groups and meetings, and it is expected to go to Council in spring 2011.

The main goals of the Facilities Master Plan update were to validate the existing threshold standard requiring 500 square feet of libraries per 1,000 people, to evaluate the viability of the Rancho del Rey library site, and to analyze possible interim alternatives to a full-size library on the east side of Interstate 805.

According to the Master Plan, the existing threshold standard is valid. But the viability of the Rancho del Rey library site is questioned. The Master Plan recommends developing a larger library further east. "In the long term, a single new 'destination' library in east Chula Vista will be more cost-effective to build and operate than multiple smaller library branches." And, it should be located "convenient to SR-125, preferably on the east side, in order to best serve residents of this underserved area."

Currently, a 30,000-square-foot library is planned for the Rancho del Rey site, and another 30,000-square-foot library is planned for a site in the Eastern Urban Center (EUC). If the draft Library Facilities Master Plan is adopted by Council, then combining the Rancho del Rey square footage with the library branch planned in the EUC may be more fiscally feasible for the city, and the threshold standard may be met sooner, since city management estimates that construction funds for the Rancho del Rey library may not be available for ten more years.

3.2 POLICE

Threshold Standard:

Priority I

Emergency Response: Properly equipped and staffed police units shall respond to 81% of the Priority I emergency calls throughout the City within seven (7) minutes and shall maintain an average response time to all Priority I calls of five minutes and thirty seconds (5.5 minutes) or less (measured annually).

Priority II

Urgent Response: Properly equipped and staffed police units shall respond to 57% of the Priority II urgent calls throughout the City within seven (7) minutes and shall maintain an average response time to all Priority II calls of seven minutes and thirty seconds (7.5 minutes) or less (measured annually).

Threshold Finding:

Priority I:	Compliance
Priority II:	Non-Compliance

Threshold Standard	Percent	Time	AverageTime
Emergency Response (Priority 1)	81.0%	7 minutes	5:30 min./sec.
Urgent Response (Priority 2)	57.0%	7 minutes	7:30 min./sec
Actual			
Emergency Response (Priority 1)	85.1%	7 minutes	4:28 min./sec.
Urgent Response (Priority 2)	49.8%	7 minutes	9:55 min./sec.

3.2.1 Priority I Threshold Findings

PRIORITY I CFS – Emergency Response, Calls For Service				
	Call Volume	% of Call Responses Within 7 Minutes	Average Response Time	Average Dispatch Time
Threshold		81.0%	5:30	N/A¹
FY 2009-10	673 of 68,145	85.1%	4:28	N/A
FY 2008-09	788 of 70,051	84.6%	4:26	N/A
FY 2007-08	1,006 of 74,192	87.9%	4:19	N/A
FY 2006-07	976 of 74,277	84.5%	4:59	N/A
FY 2005-06	1,068 of 73,075	82.3%	4:51	N/A
FY 2004-05	1,289 of 74,106	80.0%	5:11	N/A
FY 2003-04	1,322 of 71,000	82.1%	4:52	N/A
FY 2002-03	1,424 of 71,268	80.8%	4:55	N/A
FY 2001-02²	1,539 of 71,859	80.0%	5:07	N/A
FY 2000-01	1,734 of 73,977	79.7%	5:13	N/A
FY 1999-00	1,750 of 76,738	75.9%	5:21	N/A
CY 1999³	1,890 of 74,405	70.9%	5:50	N/A
FY 1997-98	1,512 of 69,196	74.8%	5:47	N/A
FY 1996-97	1,968 of 69,904	83.8%	4:52	N/A
FY 1995-96	1,915 of 71,197	83.0%	4:46	N/A

Issue: None

¹ Officers are dispatched while in the field on patrol, therefore there is no time delay when a call is dispatched.

² All figures after FY 2000-2001 (as well as Priority II figures on the next page) reflect a change in citizen-initiated call reporting criteria. Prior to FY 01-02, citizen-initiated calls were determined according to call type; they are now determined according to received source.

³ The FY98-99 GMOC report used calendar 1999 data due to the implementation of the new CAD system in mid-1998.

Discussion: During the period under review, the Police Department responded to 85.1% of Priority I Emergency Response calls within 7 minutes, a half percent better than last year, and 5.1% better than the threshold standard requires.

With an average response time of 4 minutes and 28 seconds, the response time was two seconds longer than last year, and is one minute and two seconds better than the threshold standard requires.

3.2.2 Non-Compliance of Priority II Threshold

PRIORITY II CFS – Urgent Response, Calls for Service				
	Call Volume	% of Call Responses Within 7 Minutes	Average Response Time	Average Dispatch Time
Threshold		57.0%	7:30	N/A ¹
FY 2009-10	22,240 of 68,145	49.8%	9:55	N/A
FY 2008-09	22,686 of 70,051	53.5%	9:16	N/A
FY 2007-08	23,955 of 74,192	53.1%	9:18	N/A
FY 2006-07	24,407 of 74,277	43.3%	11:18	N/A
FY 2005-06	24,876 of 73,075	40.0%	12:33	N/A
FY 2004-05	24,923 of 74,106	40.5%	11:40	N/A
FY 2003-04	24,741 of 71,000	48.4%	9:50	N/A
FY 2002-03 ²	22,871 of 71,268	50.2%	9:24	N/A
FY 2001-02	22,199 of 71,859	45.6%	10:04	N/A
FY 2000-01	25,234 of 73,977	47.9%	9:38	N/A
FY 1999-00	23,898 of 76,738	46.4%	9:37	N/A
CY 1999	20,405 of 74,405	45.8%	9:35	N/A
FY 1997-98	22,342 of 69,196	52.9%	8:13	N/A
FY 1996-97	22,140 of 69,904	62.2%	6:50	N/A
FY 1995-96	21,743 of 71,197	64.5%	6:38	N/A

Issue: Priority II calls continue to fall short of complying with the threshold standard.

Discussion: For the 13th consecutive year, the threshold standard for Priority II - Urgent Response has not been met. After two years of significant improvements, the average response time took 39 seconds longer than last year, and the percentage of calls responded to within 7 minutes fell by 3.7%. The Police Department attributes the decline in performance during this review period to the fact that the patrol division experienced higher than normal on-duty injuries to sworn personnel, resulting in lower staffing levels.

¹ Officers are dispatched while in the field on patrol, therefore there is no time delay when a call is dispatched.

² These figures do not include responses to false alarms, beginning in FY 2002-03.

The Police Department asserts that adequate staffing levels are crucial to meeting the existing Priority II threshold standard; additional staff is needed, and the department does not anticipate having the necessary resources available for more staff in the near future, due to the city's "current budget crisis."

They believe that, despite the modernization, extra training and other intermediary steps that were taken over the past 13 years to try and meet the Priority II threshold standard, "achieving the Priority II threshold was just not possible." And, "without a large increase in the number of officers in the patrol division, the department will never be able to meet the Priority II threshold, as currently stated," they report.

The GMOC's 2010 Annual Report acknowledged that modification of the Priority II threshold standard might be appropriate, and recommended that this be considered during the top-to-bottom review. In anticipation of top-to-bottom discussions, the Police Department began doing research on the origins of the city's Priority II threshold standard and how it compares to the standard in other police departments. In that process, they discovered that a comparison was not possible, due to the way that other agencies calculate their response time averages. Chula Vista's Police Department currently calculates and reports its response times to the GMOC each year based upon "Route to Arrive" times, which is the time from when the call is routed from the call-taker to the dispatcher (for dispatch of an officer to the call), until the time an officer arrives on scene. Although the city of San Diego's Police Department also uses this method, all other cities in San Diego County use the "industry standard" "Received to Arrive" times, which is the time from when the call is initially received in the dispatch center to when the officer arrives on scene. Consequently, those response times are longer, and average between 12 and 13 minutes. The Police Department indicated that they have further research to conduct before they can determine what their recommended change to the Priority II threshold standard will be.

Recommendation: That City Council direct the Police Department to gather and provide the GMOC with historical, statistical and any other necessary information regarding the Priority II threshold standard in time to support the GMOC's review of the standard in its top-to-bottom review.

3.3 TRAFFIC

Threshold Standard:

Citywide: Maintain Level of Service (LOS) "C" or better as measured by observed average travel speed on all signalized arterial segments, except that during peak hours a LOS "D" can occur for no more than two hours of the day.

West of I-805: Those signalized arterial segments that do not meet the standard above, may continue to operate at their current (year 1991) LOS, but shall not worsen.

Threshold Finding: Non-Compliance

3.3.1 Non-Compliance of Threshold Standard

Issue: One arterial segment was non-compliant.

Discussion: During the period under review, Heritage Road, southbound from Telegraph Canyon Road to Olympic Parkway, did not meet the threshold standard, exceeding LOS “D” for more than two hours during peak hours. During the previous review period, it was in compliance, but the northbound segment was out of compliance. This year, the northbound segment complied (see table below).

SEGMENT (Limits)	DIR	LOS 2009 (Hours)	LOS 2010 (Hours)	CHANGE
Heritage Road (Telegraph Canyon Road -- Olympic Parkway)	NB	D(5) E(1) Non-Compliance	C(5) D(1) In Compliance	-4D, -1E
Heritage Road (Telegraph Canyon Road -- Olympic Parkway)	SB	B(1) C(5) In Compliance	C(2) D(4) Non-Compliance	-3C, +4D

The GMOC is pleased with the improvements that have occurred over the past several years and encourages traffic engineering to keep monitoring and finding solutions for the problem segments.

Recommendation: That City Council direct city engineers to implement proposed short-term solutions to the out-of-compliance southbound segment of Heritage Road approaching Olympic Parkway.

3.3.2 Olympic Parkway Congestion

Issue: LOS “E” registered on a segment of Olympic Parkway.

Discussion: Traffic monitoring runs conducted after the conclusion of the reporting period (June 30, 2010) showed that westbound Olympic Parkway from east of Brandywine Avenue to Oleander Avenue near Interstate 805 was registering at Level of Service (LOS) “E” in the a.m. City engineers attribute this primarily to two conditions: 1) low levels of usage of SR-125 because of toll aversion, which has caused people to use Olympic Parkway to a greater degree; and 2) the growing need to complete the planned connection of Heritage Road south from Olympic Parkway to Main Street.

City engineers report that the short-term solution to remedy the problem during the a.m. period would be to increase the storage length of westbound Olympic Parkway to the southbound Brandywine Avenue left

turn pocket so that the left turning traffic does not block the westbound through lane. The loss of one westbound through lane increases delay to the through movement. Also, additional signal loop detectors should be added at the I-805/East Orange Avenue/Olympic Parkway signals, in conjunction with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). Improvement plans have been prepared and city engineers are currently awaiting final approval to commence the work. This work will allow Caltrans the ability to make even further traffic signal timing changes to help reduce vehicular delays approaching the interchange.

While the GMOC is supportive of these short-term solutions, we emphasize the need to address the long-term solutions, which are to extend Heritage Road southbound from Olympic Parkway to Main Street, and to increase use of SR-125.

Recommendation: That City Council direct city engineers to move in a timely manner to establish development phasing scenarios indicating necessary construction timing for connecting Heritage Road to Main Street.

Recommendation: That City Council, in cooperation with other agencies, implement strategies to increase usage of SR-125.

3.4 FISCAL

Threshold Standards:

1. The GMOC shall be provided with an annual fiscal impact report which provides an evaluation of the impacts of growth on the City, both in terms of operations and capital improvements. This report should evaluate actual growth over the previous 12-month period, as well as projected growth over the next 12- to 18-month period, and 5-year period.
2. The GMOC shall be provided with an annual Development Impact Fee (DIF) Report, which provides an analysis of development impact fees collected and expended over the previous 12-month period.

Threshold Finding: In Compliance

3.4.1 **Prioritization of Projects Funded By Public Facilities Development Impact Fees (PFDIF) Program**

Issue: Despite the GMOC's repeated recommendations that the City Council, the City Manager and Finance Department staff work together to develop a Public Facilities Development Impact Fees (PFDIF) prioritization policy, it appears that no action has been taken to complete the policy.

Discussion:

At the Joint Workshop on June 5, 2008, some Council members commented that they would like to see a priority policy of PFDIF projects on a regular basis, and made the following suggestion in regards to ensuring adequate funding for all facility projects slated for construction: *“Implement a policy on the construction of facilities. Include language for dealing with priorities, how facilities would be funded, how they would be reported, and impacts of the expenditures.”*

The GMOC made similar recommendations in their 2009 and 2010 annual reports, specifying “That the City Council direct the City Manager” to develop such a priority policy. Finance Department staff indicated that they intended to bring a policy to Council by the end of 2009 or 2010, but that has not occurred.

Recommendation: That, within 90 days of the date of this report, the City Council agendaize for a Council meeting action to decide whether or not to adopt a PFDIF prioritization policy or other appropriate mechanism for construction or delivery of the remaining facilities in the PFDIF fund.

3.5 FIRE / EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES

Threshold Standard:

Emergency response: Properly equipped and staffed fire and medical units shall respond to calls throughout the city within seven (7) minutes in 80% (current service to be verified) of the cases (measured annually).

Threshold Finding: In Compliance

3.5.1 Reporting Period Consistency

FIRE/EMS - Emergency Response Times			COMPARISON	
Review Period	Call Volume	% of All Call Responses W/in 7 Minutes	Average Response Time for 80% of Calls	Average Travel Time
THRESHOLD		80%		
FY 2010	10,296	85.0%	5:09	3:40
FY 2009	9,363	84.0%	4:46	3:33
FY 2008	9,883	86.9%	6:31	3:17
FY 2007	10,020	88.1%	6:24	3:30
CY 2006	10,390	85.2%	6:43	3:36
CY 2005	9907	81.6%	7:05	3:31
FY 2003-04	8420	72.9%	7:38	3:32
FY 2002-03	8088	75.5%	7:35	3:43
FY 2001-02	7626	69.7%	7:53	3:39
FY 2000-01	7128	80.8%	7:02	3:18

Note: Reporting period for FY 2001-02 and 2002-03 is for October 1, 2002 to September 30, 2003. The difference in 2004 performance when compared to 2003 is within the 2.5% range of expected yearly variation and not statistically significant.

Issue: None

Discussion: The Fire response time threshold standard was met during fiscal year 2010, beating it by five percent (a 1% improvement from 2009).

3.5.2 Effects of Using San Diego Dispatch

Issue: None

Discussion: Since outsourcing Chula Vista's emergency dispatch system in March 2008, the percentage of calls responded to within seven minutes is approximately what it was prior to outsourcing, and at 85% is well within the 80% threshold standard.

DISPATCH COMPARATIVE DATA Before and After Transition to San Diego Dispatch					
Dates	Call Volume	Average Response Time	Average Dispatch Time	Average Travel Time	% of Calls Responded to w/in 7 Minutes
FY 2009/10	10,296	6:11	20 seconds	3:40	85.0
FY 2008/09	9,363	5:23	32 seconds	3:33	84.0
3-4-08 thru 6-30-08	3,012	5:29	35 seconds	3:14	82.2
7-1-07 thru 3-3-08*	6,871	4:58	11 seconds	3:19	87.4

*Prior to transfer of dispatching services to San Diego Dispatch on 3-4-08.

3.5.3 Aging Engine Fleet

Issue: Not replacing aging fire equipment may result in longer response times.

Discussion: The Fire Department reports that its aging reserve engine fleet is beginning to hinder its performance capabilities. The older reserve fleet has smaller engines, older suspension and smaller brakes, all of which may reduce their ability to respond adequately.

Recommendation: That City Council direct the Fire Department to pursue maintenance/replacement strategies for aging equipment that will ensure that the threshold standard will continue to be met.

3.5.4 Fire Facilities Master Plan

Issue: None.

Discussion: A draft Fire Facilities Master Plan has been completed and is currently in public review. It is expected to go to City Council for consideration by May 2011.

3.6 SCHOOLS

Threshold Standard:

The City of Chula Vista shall annually provide the two local school districts Chula Vista Elementary School District (CVESD) and Sweetwater Union School District (SUHSD), with a 12-18 month forecast and request an evaluation of their ability to accommodate the forecasted and continuing growth. The Districts' replies should address the following:

1. Amount of current capacity now used or committed.
2. Ability to absorb forecasted growth in affected facilities.
3. Evaluation of funding and site availability for projected new facilities.
4. Other relevant information the Districts desire to communicate to the City and GMOC.

Threshold Finding: CVESD – In Compliance
SUHSD – In Compliance

3.6.1 **Potential Non-Compliance**

Issue: There is potential for the Chula Vista Elementary School District to be non-compliant in the short-term (12-18 months), as well as five years from now.

Discussion: Both the Chula Vista Elementary School District and the Sweetwater Union High School District indicate that additional facilities will be required to accommodate growth in the next five years, and that they will be constructed when funding is available.

Chula Vista Elementary School District

Sites have been identified for construction of schools in Otay Ranch Villages 11 and 2; however, state funding is unpredictable, at this time.

In addition to the condition of the state's budget, one reason state funding has been challenging to get is because the state looks at the district as a whole when it comes to reporting capacity versus enrollment. With empty seats in schools west of I-805, it is not apparent to the state that Chula Vista needs more elementary schools in the more densely populated east side. However, State Bill SB5056 was recently passed, which will allow districts to report by the high school attendance area. Changing school boundaries has been considered by the district, as well as moving some of its portable classrooms from the west side of the city to the east.

Sweetwater Union High School District

If forecasted population occurs according to projections, the district anticipates needing to construct both a new middle school and new high school in eastern Chula Vista within the next five years.

The GMOC noted that there are some bad segments of traffic circulation patterns concentrated among school areas. In anticipation of the construction of new schools, the GMOC recommended that the district, the developer and traffic engineering work together very early on in the planning stages, before a Sectional Planning Area Plan goes through the entitlement process, to discuss where a school will be located.

3.7 PARKS & RECREATION

Threshold Standard:

Three acres of neighborhood and community parkland with appropriate facilities shall be provided per 1,000 residents east of I-805.

Threshold Finding: In Compliance

3.7.1 Threshold Compliance

Issue: None

Discussion: The parkland threshold standard is in compliance, and currently exceeds the requirement for three acres of parkland per 1,000 residents in eastern Chula Vista. With the opening of Mount San Miguel Community Park and All Seasons Neighborhood Park, the park supply ratio of 3.45 acres per 1,000 residents should remain for the next 12-18 months.

The projected construction of parks in Otay Ranch Village Two will provide a ratio of 3.08 acres per 1,000 residents through the projected five-year growth forecast.

3.7.2 Parks & Recreation Facilities Master Plan

Issue: None.

Discussion: A draft Parks & Recreation Facilities Master Plan has been completed and is currently in public review. It is expected to go to City Council for consideration in spring 2011.

3.8 **SEWER**

Threshold Standards:

1. Sewage flows and volumes shall not exceed City Engineering Standards (75% of design capacity).
2. The City shall annually provide the San Diego Metropolitan Wastewater Authority with a 12 to 18-month development forecast and request confirmation that the projection is within the City's purchased capacity rights and an evaluation of their ability to accommodate the forecasted and continuing growth, or the City Public Works Department staff shall gather the necessary data. The information provided to the GMOC shall include:
 - a. Amount of current capacity now used or committed.
 - b. Ability of affected facilities to absorb forecasted growth.
 - c. Evaluation of funding and site availability for projected new facilities.
 - d. Other relevant information.

The growth forecast and Authority response letters shall be provided to the GMOC for inclusion in its review.

Threshold Finding: In Compliance

3.8.1. Long-Term Treatment Capacity

<i>SEWAGE - Flow and Treatment Capacity</i>					
Million Gallons per Day (MGD)	08/09 Fiscal Year	09/10 Fiscal Year	Projection for next 18 months	Projection for next 5 years	Projection for "Build-out"**
Average Flow	16.517	16.219	16.916**	18.542	26.2
Capacity	20.864	20.864	20.864	20.864	20.864

*Buildout Projection based on Chula Vista Wastewater Master Plan (2005) utilizing the "Preferred Alternative" model as was adopted in the last General Plan Update.

**Assumes a total of 1752 EDU's per year

Issue: None.

Discussion: The 5-year forecast for Chula Vista's average daily sewage flow in Million Gallons per Day (MGD) does not exceed the city's treatment capacity allotted through city contracts with the City of San Diego's Metro System. However, as reported in GMOC's 2009 Annual Report, the city has been looking at various options as possible methods for the city to meet our projected build-out sewage flow estimates. (The 2005 Wastewater

Master Plan indicated that Chula Vista would need to acquire an additional 5 MGDs of treatment capacity to facilitate the city's build-out.)

A 2007 study concluded that it was feasible to construct two Membrane Bioreactor (MBR) Wastewater Reclamation Plants in Chula Vista, each with a capacity to treat up to four MGD. However, with questions remaining regarding the infrastructure required to serve the project, emergency backup plans in case of power failure, and the use/disposal of recycled water generated by the plant throughout the year, city staff had further research to conduct. At this time, an additional study regarding a Chula Vista MBR plant is currently being finalized in a coordinated effort between City of Chula Vista and Otay Water District staff. The study is evaluating larger plant sizes than previous studies did, and it includes a more detailed understanding of specific plant design requirements, construction costs, recycled water demands for the region, and permitting requirements. The study results are forthcoming.

While the MBR option is being considered, the city is still investigating other options for increasing sewer capacity, including the possibility of purchasing additional treatment capacity rights from the San Diego Metro System. In 2009, the California Coastal Commission issued a five-year environmental waiver to San Diego's Point Loma Treatment Plant, which does not comply with the federal Clean Water Act requirement to add secondary treatment to sewage before it is discharged into the ocean. As part of the negotiations to obtain the waiver, a major regional recycled water study was required; it is currently under way and is expected to be completed in June 2011. The city of San Diego Public Utilities Department will use the results of the recycled water study to propose what direction the Point Loma Treatment Plant should take.

3.9 DRAINAGE

Threshold Standards:

1. Storm water flows and volumes shall not exceed city engineering standards.
2. The GMOC shall annually review the performance of the city's storm drain system to determine its ability to meet that goal.

Threshold Finding: In Compliance

3.9.1 Maintenance of Existing Drainage Channels

Issue: None.

Discussion: Despite limited funding, the city has done a good job of maintaining drainage channels, concurrently staying within the confines of

environmental agencies, and once again, complying with growth management's threshold standard.

3.10 AIR QUALITY

Threshold Standard:

The GMOC shall be provided with an Annual Report which:

1. Provides an overview and evaluation of local development projects approved during the prior year to determine to what extent they implemented measures designed to foster air quality improvement pursuant to relevant regional and local air quality improvement strategies.
2. Identifies whether the City's development regulations, policies, and procedures are consistent with current applicable federal, state, and regional air quality regulations and programs.
3. Identifies non-development related activities being undertaken by the City toward compliance with relevant federal, state, and local regulations regarding air quality, and whether the City has achieved compliance.

The City shall provide a copy of said report to the Air Pollution Control District (APCD) for review and comment. In addition, the APCD shall report on overall regional and local air quality conditions, the status of regional air quality improvement implementation efforts under the Regional Air Quality Strategy and related federal and state programs, and the affect of those efforts/programs on the City of Chula Vista and local planning and development activities.

Threshold Finding: In Compliance

3.10.1 Threshold Compliance

Issue: None.

Discussion: The city is doing a good job of meeting environmental objectives of Chula Vista's General Plan, specifically Objective E6: "Improve local air quality by minimizing the production and emission of air pollutants and toxic air contaminants and limit the exposure of people to such pollutants."

The city's Climate Change Working Group, comprised of residents, businesses, and community representatives, is one force that is helping the city meet the objective above. Since City Council adopted the Group's recommended implementation plans for seven carbon-reducing measures in 2008, Council reconvened the Group to develop *Climate Adaptation Strategies*. Such strategies will help the city reduce its risks and costs from future climate change impacts, such as sea level rise, prolonged heat waves, greater local energy/water demand, and more

frequent wildfires. Based on the Climate Change Working Group's recommendations, city staff is now developing implementation plans for 11 strategies that would help "adapt" to climate change impacts, as well as reduce energy/water use and improve local air quality. The implementation plans are scheduled to be presented to City Council in April 2011 for final review and consideration.

City staff has also been actively implementing and/or participating in several programs that will improve air quality, including:

- *South Bay Power Plant Decommissioning*
- *Regional Electric Vehicle Project*
- *Bike Chula Vista Project & New Bikeway Master Plan*
- *Home Upgrade, Carbon Downgrade*
- *Free Resource & Business Energy Evaluations (FREBE)*

Details on these programs are available in the Air Quality questionnaire, located in Appendix B of this report.

An important component of the Growth Management Program is the requirement for larger development projects to create Air Quality Improvement Plans (AQIPs). In the past year, the City's AQIP thresholds were updated to further emphasize lower greenhouse gas and criteria air pollutant emissions through passive solar design, energy-saving landscaping strategies, and public transit/pedestrian-focused transportation networks.

3.11 WATER

Threshold Standards:

1. Developer will request and deliver to the City a service availability letter from the Water District for each project.
2. The City shall annually provide the San Diego County Water Authority, the Sweetwater Authority, and the Otay Municipal Water District with a 12-18 month development forecast and request evaluation of their ability to accommodate the forecast and continuing growth. The districts' replies should address the following:
 - a. Water availability to the City and Planning Area, considering both short and long term perspectives.
 - b. Amount of current capacity, including storage capacity, now used or committed.
 - c. Ability of affected facilities to absorb forecast growth.
 - d. Evaluation of funding and site availability for projected new facilities.
 - e. Other relevant information the districts desire to communicate to the City and GMOC.

Threshold Finding: In Compliance

3.11.1 Meeting Water Demands

Issue: None

Discussion: Otay Water District and Sweetwater Authority serve the City of Chula Vista, and both report that they will be able to meet the water demands of anticipated growth over the next five years. Specific data is available in the Otay Water District and Sweetwater Authority questionnaires, located in Appendix B of this report.

Otay Water District

The Otay Water District (OWD) has developed, and annually reviews, its Water Resources Master Plan (WRMP), which relies on growth projection data provided by SANDAG, the City of Chula Vista, and the development community; it serves as a guide to reevaluate the best alternatives for providing reliable water system facilities. Integral to the annual review process is ensuring that capital improvement program projects are funded and constructed in a timely manner, and verifying that they correspond with development construction activities and water demand growth that require new or upgraded facilities.

OWD's need for a ten-day water supply during a San Diego County Water Authority shutdown is actively being implemented, and has been fully addressed in the WRMP and the Integrated Water Resources Plan (IRP), which incorporates the concepts of water storage and supply from neighboring water agencies to meet emergency and alternative water supply needs. OWD works closely with City of Chula Vista staff to ensure that the necessary planning information remains current.

OWD assures that there is a reliable water supply for the City of Chula Vista's long-term growth, including from a Baja desalination plant. It intends to have sufficient, reliable supplies to serve demands, despite inevitable challenges, such as climatological, environmental, and legal.

Sweetwater Authority

Sweetwater Authority has several maintenance and upgrade programs where pipelines, valves and other facilities are constantly being renewed. This allows the Authority to continue to provide service in the near- and long-term. The 2007 Water Facilities Master Plan lists almost all proposed projects and estimated costs. In addition, the Reynolds Desalination Plant expansion should be in operation by 2012-13, and the Perdue Treatment plant is being upgraded to meet new treatment standards.

4.0 Appendices

4.1 Appendix A – Growth Forecast

4.2 Appendix B – Threshold Compliance Questionnaires